

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-22 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 9, 11, 19, and 21 are amended as proposed by the Examiner to place the application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

### **I. Telephone Conversation**

Applicants thank Examiner Jennifer N. To for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative during the August 21, 2006 telephone conversation. During the conversation, Applicants' representative confirmed that previously proposed amendments from the PTO would be entered in this Final Office Action. Examiner To indicated that the proposed amendments would place the application in condition for allowance. Examiner To also stated that a final search would be performed prior to finding the application allowable.

### **II. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Alleged Obviousness Based on *Anti-cult* and *Kesinger***

The Final Office Action rejects claims 1-5, 7-15 and 17-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Anti-cult* "Cache Directories – delete them sometimes", alt.religion.scientology, 01/30/1997 (hereinafter referred to as *Anti-cult*), in view of *Kesinger*, "Two very simple solutions", comp.infosystems.www.authoring.html, 10/26/1995 (hereinafter referred to as *Kesinger*). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 9, 11, 19, and 21 are amended as proposed by the Examiner to place the application in condition for allowance. Claims 2-5, 7-8, 12-15, and 17-18 depend from independent claims 1 and 11, respectively. Therefore, claims 2-5, 7-8, 12-15, and 17-18 are also in condition for allowance at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims 1 and 11. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-5, 7-15 and 17-22 under 35 U.S.C §103(a).

### **III. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Alleged Obviousness Based on *Anti-cult*, *Kesinger* and *Davis***

The Office Action rejects claims 6 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Anti-cult* in view of *Kesinger*, as applied in claim 1 above, and in view of *Davis* "Sharing Netscape cache?", "comp.unix.admin", 6/4/1997. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 6 and 16 depend from independent claims 1 and 11, respectively. Therefore, claims 6 and 16 are also in condition for allowance at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims 1 and 11. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

**IV. Conclusion**

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the cited references and is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: September 26, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

/Gerald H. Glanzman/

Gerald H. Glanzman  
Reg. No. 25,035  
Yee & Associates, P.C.  
P.O. Box 802333  
Dallas, TX 75380  
(972) 385-8777  
Attorney for Applicants

GHG/vja